

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant has amended the specification multiple times to include examples and more information as requested by the Examiner. In order to ensure that the Examiner has a complete version of the specification as amended, Applicants have submitted a substitute specification in accordance with 37 CFR 1.125(b). The specification is as it would have read after the last office action response, except for the priority claim on page 1.

Further, the amendments to the claims below are more than adequately described in the specification. The amendments to claims 1 and 11 are supported at page 3, lines 6-29 in the substitute specification reflecting previous amendments to the specification, and page 3, lines 3-17 in the originally filed specification. The amendments to claim 15 are supported in the specification on page 5, starting on page 19 in the substitute specification, page 5, line 7 in the originally filed specification. Applicant submits that these amendments overcome the rejection and request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious by Shaheen et al. (US Patent No. 5,893,920) in view of Lew et al. (US Patent No. 6,385,567).

Shaheen discloses a portable cache management system in which the cache is managed to avoid overflow. The cache is on the local file system of a client system connected to a network. See Shaheen, col. 5, lines 25-65.

Lew, et al., teaches a translation module in which program modules for two different operating systems are loaded by one loader into one load list, instead of having one load list of program modules for the first operating system and a load list for the second operating system. The term 'multiple' as used in Lew is directed to having one loader capable of producing one load list for 'programs written for multiple platforms.' The programs executed by the loader are already programmed for multiple platforms.

In contrast, the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 11 is a memory device upon which are stored multiple emulators, or versions, of many different operating systems. The memory device also contains a data file that stores the necessary elements of an operating system to be emulated. When the proper emulator is selected, it accesses the data file to determine which elements are needed and the emulator executes those elements to create an emulated operating environment. This allows applications from the emulated operating system to be executed on other systems such that they do not have to already be written for multiple platforms.

With regard to claim 1 as amended, the combination does not disclose a memory device upon which are stored multiple emulators and a data file containing the necessary elements to emulate and operating system, as discussed above. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2-8 and 10 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-8 and 10 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claim 11 as amended, the combination does not teach storing a data file containing the elements of an operating system needed to emulate an operating system on a memory device having multiple emulators from a first computer, disconnecting the memory device, and then connecting it to a second computer to run an emulator and establish an emulated operating system. It is therefore submitted that claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 12-14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(e) as obvious by Shaheen in view of Gaines (US Patent No. 5,961,582).

Gaines teaches using a remote computer to reach a host computer such that a virtual operating system is established on the host computer to allow a user to access the host computer. Host task management the two computers are allowed, see col. 10, lines 10-35, but monitored to ensure that the second computer is not 'harmed' by the interaction. See Gaines, col. 5, lines 5-29.

In contrast, claim 15, as amended, disables host task management on the host computer and only allows the emulated operating system on the memory device to operate. It is therefore submitted that claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 16-19 depend from claim 15 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the

limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 16-19 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lew as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of Gaines.

It should be noted that claim 9, as amended, is merely a further limitation on the multiple emulators now set out in claim 1. However, the combination does not teach multiple emulators, as discussed above with regard to Lew and Gaines. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

**Customer No. 20575**

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

*Julie L. Reed*

---

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
210 S.W. Morrison Street, Suite 400  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
503-222-3613